Navigating Mold Exposure In Legal Arenas Transcript

(Transcripts are generated by AI and may contain errors)

Introduction to Mold Litigation

Welcome to mold, mycotoxins, and Chronic Illness Summit. I'm your host, Dr. Ann Shippy. And next, we get to speak with Josh Kardisch. He's an attorney with Pegasus Law Group.

He represents those involved in personal injuries from exposure to toxic substances such as mold, blood, pesticides and asbestos. Thank you so much for joining us today.

Thank you for having me. I appreciate it. So how did you get started in mold litigation? Well, originally, when I was in college, I was a pre-med major for about three and a half years until I went to work in an emergency room and saw what the practice of medicine was really like.

I knew I didn't have the stomach for it, so my second favorite subject was the law. But I do have a background in the biological sciences, and it was we'll have always been interested in the effects of various environmental toxins on the human body.

So when I graduated law school, I went to a law firm that was involved in the Agent Orange litigation a long time ago. Wow. That was a big deal. That was a very big deal.

And I got to meet some very, very talented doctors and attorneys. And I learned an awful lot about toxic torts, which is the area of law that deals with exposure to toxic substances.

And I've been representing both plaintiffs and defendants in toxic tort cases mold, asbestos led pesticide exposure for the last 37 years. Okay. So you've got quite a bit of experience in this area.

That's amazing, too. And then the fact that you've represented both sides.

How Mold Cases Are Proven in Court

Yes. Now, I work I work exclusively now on the plaintiffs side for the past several years. But I have a lot of experience on the other side, which of course, helps in learning all the different perspectives and all the different theories and the different medical and scientific specialties as well.

So if you could kind of give me a little bit of an overview, give our audience a little bit of an overview of what is happening with with mold and mycotoxin litigation.

Okay. So as a as an overview, I can say that at least in the state of New York, we have had some decisions by high courts that make it very difficult for people exposed to mold, to make it to a jury.

We have a process in New York that's called summary judgment, and that is essentially when in mold cases, defendants ask the court to dismiss cases because the plaintiff can't meet their burden of proof.

Unlike other areas of toxic towards because exposure to mold can create an amalgam of different symptoms that people can get from colds and flus and allergies and asthma.

There's no signature injury to mold as there is to other substances. It's very difficult for a plaintiff to prove their case, and it's just as difficult for the plaintiff to get past that summary judgment stage and make it to a jury.

So at least in the state of New York, there are not many plaintiffs attorneys who take on mold cases because they are difficult to prove. And that's probably a lot of other states, too.

I know that that's been the way it's been in Texas, too. Yes, Texas, I think, is the jurisdiction where the first couple of mold cases were litigated many years ago and sometime in the mid eighties.

But in environments where there is a lot of rain and there's a lot of water damage, Maryland being another location where you see a lot of mold cases.

And New York, of course, we see a lot of people that are exposed to water infiltration and to mold. But the courts have not really been too kind to the plaintiffs in those cases.

Yeah. Okay. So it's a tough it's a tough landscape to even think about having, you know, filing a lawsuit. So. Yes. What are the situations that you think it's worthwhile considering?

Well, let me let me just start by saying that in the area of mold litigation, the laws are identical to the laws, laws and general premises liability cases.

So a landlord has a legal obligation to maintain his residential premises at a reasonable, safe condition. And that's true, whether we're talking about a stair railing, a front stoop or water conditions that can cause mold to flourish.

So the plaintiffs are generally speaking, the tenant in these cases has to prove that the owner created some sort of defective condition that allowed for water damage to exist and remain, or that he did not create it, but knew about it for a sufficient amount of time during which he should have remediated the situation.

The tenant has to prove that he was exposed to mold spores for a sufficient amount of time to have caused harm and that that exposure actually caused the harm that the plaintiff is alleging.

The most difficult aspect of these cases is proving that there was an exposure that is long enough to create the symptoms that the plaintiff is complaining about, and that is usually the area that landlords attack when they make applications to the court to dismiss cases.

So most of the cases that we've seen in the area of mold are that articulate the standards that a plaintiff has to prove. The elements of prove come in the context of the defendant asking the court to dismiss the case early on.

So we have some very seminal cases in New York. There's one case that came out in 2006 called Parker against Mobil Oil Corporation, and that went up to the Court of Appeals, which is the highest court in New York State.

And what that court said was that in order for the tenant to prove all the elements of exposure to mold sufficient to make it to a jury and prove his case, he must employ a methodology.

And in New York, we still use the Frye standard as opposed to the Delbert standing for deciding expert admissibility. And the Frye Standard says that the theory has to be generally accepted in the scientific community.

Most states have adopted a more flexible Daubert standard. But in New York, this Parker case said that there has to be a sound methodology for the plaintiff to prove that there's a relationship between the disease and the specific factor suspected of causing the disease.

And that's always the subject area of experts. So here's where we get into the idea of general causation versus specific causation. And the Park case said that the plaintiff has to provide evidence in the form of scientific literature that the toxin in this case mold, is capable of producing the particular illness.

That's general causation because that applies to all people, and that the level of exposure to the toxin that will produce the illness is sufficient. And that's the idea of the dose response relationship.

Damages, Settlements, and Building Responsibility

So the first thing that a plaintiff has to prove is that this mold condition existed and the next thing they have to prove

is that there is enough scientific literature to show that mold can cause the symptoms that the plaintiff is alleging.

And that's that's usually the subject of this dose response relations trip proof. The next thing that the plaintiff has to prove is what we call specific causation.

And that means that the plaintiff has to show that the probable entity that mold caused this particular plaintiff's illness exists. So this analysis by necessity, involves weighing the possibility that mold caused the illness as a whole as opposed to other things that may have caused the illness.

And from a medical perspective, that's a matter of making a differential diagnosis, that it's mold as opposed to some other factors. Expert opinions on causation in this area has to set forth the amount of exposure to the source of the toxin and whether it's capable of causing the illness and whether it caused the illness in this particular circumstance.

So the park, the case essentially denied summary judgment to the landlord because the plaintiff, through the use of expert testimony and scientific literature, was able to show that there is at least a credible amount of evidence to show both general and specific causation.

Ultimately, the jury has to make the determination as to which side's experts are the most credible and just less than ten years ago, there was a very famous case called Cornell.

Cornell versus 360 West 51st Street. And that went a little bit further than the Harvard case in terms of defining what the elements of proof are. And that said that the plaintiff must be able to show not just that there was mold in the apartment or the the residential dwelling, but that those levels were greater than that would be expected, that which would be expected and greater than the ambient environment outside the premises.

So there's a very specific requirement. You can't just point to black mold growing on the inside of a shower. You have to actually have an industrial hygienist who goes in and and does scrape samples, swiped samples and also air samplings.

And that has to be an affidavit from that specialist that the amount of mold spores in the apartment or the residence is greater than that which you would find in the general environment.

So the Cornell case took that whole standard that Parker articulated a little bit further. It reiterated the fact that the point to pass to prove both general and specific causation and that the the plaintiff has to be able to show not just the exposure, that the exposure inside the dwelling caused the symptoms, but that after the point of left the premises, those symptoms continued.

So that's another element in the causation. So once somebody is left out that they don't just get better on their own. Correct. Correct. So you have to show that those symptoms persist.

Now, in some of the cases that that I have at present, I have a 6.5 mold case. It's an entire family. And I have a doctor who was able to establish that the mold caused an inflammatory process that affected the immune system.

And that's why several years after my clients vacated, they still have some of the same symptoms. So those are the two very important cases in the state of New York.

There are a number of cases from lower courts in New York recently. There's three specific cases in the last couple of years in which plaintiffs have been able to show enough to get past that summary dismissal stage and go to a jury.

As a practical matter, I would say that 99 plus percent of these cases settle because the science is not established enough to be able that anybody wants to take a chance in letting a jury make the decision.

So there are very few mold cases that actually go through a full trial. Most of them are settled because of the

scientific and the medical uncertainties involved.

The uncertainty on both sides. That's that's correct. The first thing is just to even get it to go through and you know that it's not dismissed, basically.

And then. Right. Most cases are actually being settled. So is the what kinds of things are being settled for? Is it things like medical expenses and replacing and belongings?

Like what kinds of things are people actually able to get some repair relief? Yeah, well, I mean, the plaintiffs in New York are able to get compensation for that.

What's called past pain and suffering and future pain and suffering. So that relates to the symptoms that the plaintiffs have had. What effect those symptoms have had on them.

And there are studies, quite a number of studies that are coming out that show that there are neurological sequelae of exposure to mold. It's not just upper right.

It's not just upper respiratory conditions that, you know, courts can say, oh, it's just a cold or the flu or now COVID. So there are cognitive issues that are involved.

I have cases where young people have trouble, have memory problems, have trouble concentrating. Their grades start to go down in school. So you can be compensated for that under the category of past pain and suffering.

And also, if you have a track record of having the symptoms that pain and suffering can continue into the future. All right. So those are two elements of proof.

If you're unable to work, then you can also get compensation for lost earnings. Little by little, it's coming out that there are psychological components to all of this.

Right. Depression, anxiety, fear, things like that are coming out and that's compensable as well. So property damage, Yes, that's compensable. Anything that you've had destroyed because of exposure to mold.

But the real is, as we say, the big ticket items are really the physical and psychological and emotional injuries that people suffer as a result of their exposure.

Mm hmm. Do you see things changing at all with some of these cases that are, you know, establishing Do you see that builders and landlords are starting to become, you know, more careful about how they're maintaining buildings or building buildings?

Well, I can tell you that in my in my years of representing landlords, the answer was definitely no. You know, it's all a matter of cost. So at least, you know, the landlords that I've represented.

But I do see a lot of green building now and precautions that are taken to make sure that there is no water infiltration and there are a lot of environmental companies that are cropping up that help landlords.

I see a growing trend in this area as well, helping landlords to make the appropriate decisions when there is water infiltration.

Medical Testing and Scientific Evidence

So in the particular case where I represent the six members of the family, they complained to the landlord many times about the fact that water was just flooding in from above and the landlord would come in, cut out a little piece of sheetrock, patch it or paint over it, or maybe throw some bleach on it, but it would keep happening.

So that's what we consider to be a bad landlord. The good landlords are the ones that come in, listen to what the

industrial hygienist or the or the industrial scientist says and follow those recommendations for remediation and abatement.

I think landlords are becoming more and more conscious in some regards, but there are a number, particularly in New York City, there are a number of landlord groups that have advocated, unfortunately to their their base that mold is become the new way for tenants not to pay their rent.

That mold is just a big hoax started by plaintiff oriented organizations that exposure to mold is not as harmful as the plaintiffs claim that symptoms preexisted their moving into the buildings and therefore, there are landlords who are very cynical about the complaints related to mold.

That's very unfortunate because we see a lot of young children who are most susceptible to developing asthma for for no apparent reason other than the fact that there was tremendous water infiltration into their residences and the build up of mold that landlords don't remediate.

It is so interesting talking to you, because you really are getting, you know, by taking these cases, by keeping up what's going on in this landscape.

You really do. You're so aware of a lot of these things that we are seeing in the medical field, the, you know, the the massive effect on children, you know, their ability to learn the asthma, how well their immune systems are working, the neurological changes that are happening, and then in adults as well.

So you're really getting a big picture for for what's happening in such a big way and how you know, and then how there are these names that are happening in society where, you know, there's such conflicting information that really confuse people.

Correct. Absolutely. So, you know, on the one hand, on one extreme, you have the idea that this whole mold thing is just a big scam. And on the other extreme, you have the people who really, really care about their buildings and their liability and their ability to get insurance.

And people who own properties that just simply are good people who don't want to see people getting hurt. So you have the two extremes, and I think both sides are growing.

Both extremes are growing, too, to a large extent. Yeah. I mean, we definitely we've got such an epidemic because of the way we're building the buildings and and the way that water intrusion or water leaks are not being handled properly.

So it's such a growing problem day by day, you know, with by week, year by year. Yeah, I think it's just it's really going to come to a head. But the exciting thing really is that we are getting more and more of the scientific data that we need to back up the health health issues.

So I really I can see how the landscape is going to continue to improve. You know, I'm not a litigious person. I'm not necessarily encouraging people to to do anything more than really try to get their themselves and their families better.

But I think it really is, unfortunately, one of the ways that we can help make changes and people's understanding of what they need to do to keep their own homes safer.

And then and then also how to build better buildings right in. And the more the science community and the medical community studies the problem and develops articles, the more the more the courts will be willing to accept this as not just some, you know, flaky problem that few people have, but more of, you know, this is a real condition.

This is no different than asbestosis. I mean, we know that asbestos causes asbestos as well. We do know that mold causes a variety of symptoms. Even if there is no signature injury.

It there are a variety of respiratory and internal and immunological intellectual problems. You know, I deal with one expert who has used the neuro quant technology with MRI's to show deficiencies in the brain and the shrinking of the brain after the effects, the long term effects of exposure to mold in so far as it compromises the immune system.

And it's very fascinating stuff. It really it really is. And the more that the doctors and scientists develop it, the more the courts are going to be willing to accept it.

Well, so for our listeners, the neuro quant is a very detailed MRI that shows the volumes not just is there a stroke or a lesion, but looks at the volumes of the different parts of the brain.

And we see a very certain pattern for for mold exposure. So when we see these patterns, we can be pretty sure that that mold has been the cause and of course, follow up with further investigation.

But one of the exciting things that I see in my practice is that one of my first patients with a neuro quant was actually a biology professor at U. T., highly acclaimed research, and she and her forties was noticing that her memory, she was losing her memory and it turned out that her air conditioning system had been installed to draw in the air from a crawl space that was moldy.

And so she had a huge, you know, long term exposure to mold. But what was really exciting is that when we got her removed from the situation, we helped her body to detoxify and gave her a bunch of the supplements that really help with neurological healing.

We actually saw her neuro quite get better. Wow. Wow. Yeah, that's exciting. Yeah. And so exciting. That's the other thing that's exciting for. And, you know, those of us that are practicing functional medicine and the thing that we're doing is that when we do the right things to help the body to heal, we can see all of these problems improve, the cognitive decline, the anxiety, the A. D. D., the autoimmunity and the endocrine disruption.

So that's one of the points of this summit, is to bring on the experts that are really seeing improvements in their patients to help Sarah, what's working right?

And it's not, you know, the exposure to mold and the issues that it creates are not necessarily irreversible, but there are therapies and there are some very good therapies and supplements and diet and, you know, all sorts of things whole holistically that can really improve.

I'm very I just learned about the neuro quant technology within the last several months, and I'm very glad to hear that somebody actually showed improvement.

I understood what neuro quant MRI's were in the context of Alzheimer's disease because I think that's where it was used the most using AI. And it's great to see that the scientific and medical communities are using that.

You know, it takes a certain amount of gumption to apply a technology in an area where it's not usually used. And you know, we're all seeing good, good results.

So to know where we are and then track our progress. So I think it really is an important test to consider for people that are having the cognitive issues. Yeah. Right. Yeah.

And there's also the vision. Realized that you were actually starting to be able to use it from a legal standpoint. So that's good to know. Yes. Well, we're using it in this one case that I'm working on.

I'll have to get back to you as to whether the court accepts that or not, because we're not at that stage, but we use that in visual contrast testing also to determine the effects of mold.

That's that seems to be fairly new and upcoming. And also the the genetic testing, there are certain genetic markers that show a susceptibility to the effects of mold.

As a subtype. Yes. Yes. And that's fascinating. That's very interesting. And all of this science is going to ultimately defeat a lot of the claims that the insurance companies are making that there you know, there are no markers, there are no ways of determining whether you're susceptible or allergic or anything like that.

You know, I'm very glad that the science is developing in a way that not only we can help people, but maybe we can get landlords to take responsibility and be more responsible generally.

So what other kinds of things, you know, for the people that are listening, that are thinking that that they want to go down a legal path. So, you know, there's situations where the VCs is helpful, the neuro quant, the HLA genetic typing.

You mentioned, you know, really getting a good inspector to come in and do the right testing on the environment. Are there any other tools that helped help you to make a good case?

Yes. Well, I started to mention before that that some of the experts that we deal with are looking at the effects of mold from the perspective of a chronic inflammatory syndrome. And, you know, that can explain an awful lot.

And I know that there's at least 35 articles that I've seen on that topic. So, you know, the whole process by which mold affects the body. And I have an expert that refers to it as a cytokine storm cytokines being a certain protein and that that that's what it does.

It creates so much of it that it has an adverse effect on the immune system.

Documentation, Case Strategy, and Legal Limits

So the testing for that, I know that there's VEGF, they test for that, they test for MMP nine, those are other tests that, that are used. I won't pronounce this correctly, so I'll give you the acronym TGF b11.

Yeah, Yes. And in the case that I'm working on now, my clients were each and every one of them had abnormal levels, either too high or too low, which shows or which also show the effect of mold on the body.

Sometimes the body just gets to too worn out to make the things that it needs to. Yeah. Right to overwhelmed I think I mentioned before the the visual contrast sensitivity test that that is used also to determine the effects of mold.

And in my case, all six of my clients failed that test and they obviously they should have been able to surpass that. So so those are some of the basic biological factors or tests that that we've been looking at and that are very helpful in convincing courts that this is a real phenomenon.

There is a long term effect, just like we have long COVID, there's long mold exposure, and that if we at the same time that we are trying to apply the science to the standards that landlords are supposed to follow, we need to compensate these people.

They need to be compensated. That's why landlords have insurance to compensate people for their injuries. So the more the science develops, the less likely it will be that the insurance companies can just take a, you know, what we call a no pay position and refuse to compensate people putting all their money and effort into trying to get the cases dismissed.

So actually put a lot of money into having safer buildings. Correct? Yeah. Yeah. I mean, that would be, you know, if landlord premiums could be used for those purposes and to compensate the people who need medical care.

You know, some a lot of this medical care and I'm sure you know, this specifically, the holistic solutions and treatments are not covered by a lot of insurance.

Right. The things that work don't get covered. Unfortunately, that point. Exactly. So that we need isn't covered. So

and and I see that with my clients who who my experts send for all these types of tests they have to pay out of pocket for that.

Well, if it's if these symptoms and these necessary treatments are the result of the exposure to mold in somebodies premises, then, you know, we know who should be held responsible and who should be paying for it.

And it's not the people who are being injured. So is there anything else that you think people should consider when they're trying to decide? Do I just focus on getting better or do I want to get involved in illegal cases?

I mean, because it it does it takes time, energy, money to do that as well. Are there any other things you know that people should be thinking about? Yeah, well, I mean, one thing is early blood testing, because blood tests are irrefutable.

And if there are certain findings at the microbiological level that we can show, yes, there was an exposure of more than the what would be considered a normal or an ambient amount of mold spores, That would be very helpful.

I don't take a lot of mold cases. And the reason is, is because they're hard to develop. But when I have clients that come to me and they already have a lot of the scientific testing done, like blood samples, like, you know, MRI's, like the industrial hygienist type testing, then they're further along also taking pictures, pictures, a picture is worth very huge, very huge.

And keeping diaries. You know, every time that a person complains to a landlord, keep a diary or send an email so that there's a paper trail and whatnot.

But any communication with a landlord is a must. Absolutely. Absolutely. Because when you get into court, you know, saying that, well, I called them on the phone, you know, the landlord is going to say, nobody called me on the phone, and then you can't prove what you need to prove.

But again, in the cases that I have, the cases that I consider to be good cases, there is a stream of communication, mostly from the tenant complaining about a situation, complaining that kids are getting sick and the landlord in all circumstances either will not respond at all, which helps the case, or they'll respond in writing, and that could help the case.

I have a situ. Yeah, go ahead. Oh, I was just going to say, and even if you do have a conversation, always document it. Say this is what we discussed today. Yes.

What? How I understand our conversation and send it to them so that there's no miscommunication on what you think you heard. Absolutely. I was in one case I was able to get the email communications between the landlord and the property manager.

And they're talking about how the only way to resolve the mold problem is to rip out the bathroom and start again. And the landlord very specifically said, I'm not doing that.

That's too expensive. Let these people leave. So the piece of paper, I mean, that's that's very powerful, combined with photographs of the condition, you know, that's very powerful.

So take notes, write emails, keep your emails, keep a diary of symptoms that you're feeling so that the attorneys don't have to just rely on the medical records.

I have. I tell people that all the time. Keep a diary. As long as you're still in that environment, keep a diary, write down everything that all of your kids are experiencing, feeling on a daily basis because that that's fantastic proof.

So those are all things I think, that are, you know, grassroots kind of ways to develop your case and of course, do whatever you can to get better. Yes, that's number one.

That's number one. Get out of this situation and get better. Any other cases that you'd like to share that might be helpful for people to understand how they work or what's involved?

I have I have some cases in the city of New York where particular apartments, co-op apartments or condominium apartments have had mold damage. Those are a little more difficult because what the co-op or condo is responsible for, as opposed to the tenants is always a very hot topic.

So, you know, mold on the inside of an apartment arguably is the responsibility of the tenant because it's inside. But if the water damage is coming from the outside or it's seeping in from the roof or there's a leaky pipe, then that's the co-op's responsibility.

So I do see cases like that. They're a little more difficult to prove because it's not the typical type of leasehold situation. But, you know, again, notes and photographs are the best way to to go forward.

Absolutely. There has not been a definitive Supreme Court of the United States decision on these issues, essentially ever. There are Supreme Court decisions that talk about the standard that an expert has to follow in order for his his or her testimony to be admissible.

But there are no cases like we have in New York, like the Parker case or the Cornell case that apply everywhere in the country with regards to mold. So there is no universal standard as a result.

And every case is different based upon the jurisdiction that you're living in. So unfortunately, in some states, the restrict there are a lot of restrictions on what cases go forward and what cases get dismissed.

New York I'm seeing that things are getting a little bit easier and hopefully in the case that I have pending it will the science that we presented to the court will will bear out what we're saying.

But, you know, they are difficult cases overall. They're difficult. I know plenty of toxic tort attorneys, plenty of big firms that handle a class action water contamination cases or have thousands of asbestos cases that do not take mold cases.

And and, you know, I'm hoping that that changes. Yeah, I'm hoping. That that changes. We really needed to get to where it's just as clear as, oh, Agent Orange or asbestos or lab like smoking.

You know, it is it's probably closest to smoking from anything because it's airborne contaminants, right. So it really does need to get to that point where it's just very clear and there's a national way of looking at these situations and that people are really informed right on what it takes to stay healthy, living indoors.

Right. And think about in the context of smoking, think about how long the tobacco industry denied that. You know, in my lifetime, I'm 65 years old. I remember seeing all the commercials when I was a kid about, you know, smoking is good for you and it's calm your nerves and, you know, all of that.

They were denying any harm until relatively recently. So we need to get to that point with, you know, the situation that we have with exposure and buildings.

Yeah. And there you know, there are a lot of people with a lot of money in real estate that really don't want this to come through. Correct? Absolutely.

And the hit on the insurance companies here as well. So there's there are a lot of forces that don't want to happen. Absolutely. And there's a lot of lobbying there, a lot of law firms that do nothing but lobby.

But, you know, the science is ultimately what's going to win the day. That's that's really what it is. It's it's the science and the medicine and everything that you're doing and people like you are doing to investigate it, to care about it, to care about it is you know, that's that's the first thing.

You know, you see a lot of patients that have symptoms that are inexplicable all And, you know, you're doing everything you can to find out what causes these symptoms.

And a lot of cases, I'm sure you've seen mold as as a factor. Way too often. Way too often. Yes. Yeah, maybe too often. But the good news is that we're figuring out the solutions, too.

Yes. Yes. So we're kind of and. I read I read all the articles that come out. So, you know, a lot of articles by Dr. Schumacher on on mold exposure. I think I've read every single one.

So yeah, there's a lot of like for want of a better term, good stuff that's coming out to make the case that this is something that really needs to be looked into.

I'm just going to add that in New York in 2016, after a very, very large study that was done by the Department of Health and the Mount Sinai occupation, all hazard, forget what it was called the Hazard Group.

In 2016, there was legislation actually passed in the city of New York that landlords have an obligation to go in and inspect for mold and to remediate those conditions.

And that's the result of studies. That's a result of scientific evidence. You know, it's got to be. Made about that. Yeah. Without looking at environmental toxicity, they've really moved the needle forward on several things.

So Right? They have a great team. They're very good team. Yeah. Yeah. Well, it's so great to hear from your perspective how things are moving forward.

Yes. The, you know, learning about mold for my own body and working with patients for at least 14 years. So. Well, back at the beginning, you know, it was it just seemed like not even worth it to even consider anything putting any time or effort into anything legal and and so it's just so good to hear that there's headway being made, that it will change the landscape.

It's certainly worthwhile. You know, health is the most important thing, But, you know, a large part of it is holding the response. The responsible parties libel and making them pay.

And that's that's really what it's all about from my perspective. Well, and I so appreciate it. You know, with your background in all of these different areas of toxicity, you could be passing up the mold cases also.

So thank you so much for making these changes happen. Thank you. Yes. Yeah. Of course. Great. My pleasure. Taking your your knowledge and your expertise and knowing how the law works and and reading the scientific studies.

And so also, a lot of doctors would have trouble reading Richie Shoemaker's studies because they're very complex science. Yes. Yes. But I have I have experts that help me with the parts I don't understand.

So it's but but yeah, I mean, it's it's it's wonderful that these studies are coming out and that attorneys are seeing them and the courts are saying them, you know, all of this stuff gets presented to the court, so the judges have to read them.

And yeah, it's more and more it's it's getting where it needs to be. Yeah, That's so great. Well, because ultimately the goal is prevention, you know, keeping people from getting right in the first place, right?

Absolutely. Absolutely. Well, I so appreciate your time. Thank you for your expertise and your warmth and care. Thank you. For that. You're helping. Thank you so much to you as well. To you as well.

This is this was a very nice experience. Thank you. Thank you. It.